

Charter School Application Report

# Las Vegas Montessori

*Recommendation from the Summer 2020 Charter Application Cycle*

## General Information

<b>Proposed Name</b>	Las Vegas Montessori
<b>Proposed Mission</b>	To create an environment that recognizes and fosters the vast potential of its students, and their desire to learn.
<b>Proposed Grade Configuration</b>	Opening: Kindergarten – 8 <sup>th</sup> grade Full-Scale: Kindergarten – 8 <sup>th</sup> grade
<b>Proposed Opening</b>	August 2021
<b>Proposed Location</b>	2975 S. Rainbow Boulevard Las Vegas, NV 89146 (tentative)  School anticipates primarily serving 89102, 89103, 89107, 89117, 89118, 89146 and 89147 zip codes.

## Process/Key Dates for Las Vegas Montessori

- New Charter Application Training
- February 26, 2020 – Notice of Intent is received
- July 15, 2020 – Application is received
- September 23, 2020 - Capacity Interview is conducted<sup>1</sup>
- November 6, 2020 – Recommendation is presented

---

<sup>1</sup> The Las Vegas Montessori capacity Interview was conducted virtually as a result of prevailing Emergency Directives which limit capacity of gatherings, along with space limitations within the SPCSA's offices.

## Planned Enrollment Chart

	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27
K	30	35	40	45	50	55
1	35	40	45	50	55	60
2	35	40	45	50	55	60
3	35	40	45	50	55	60
4	30	35	40	45	50	55
5	30	35	40	45	50	55
6	15	30	35	40	45	50
7	15	20	25	30	35	40
8	15	20	25	30	35	40
9						
10						
11						
<b>Total</b>	250 <sup>2</sup>	295	340	385	430	475

## Executive Summary and Recommendation

The review committee, which included one member of the SPCSA staff and two external reviewers, identified shortcomings in each of the four components of the submitted application. The review committee and SPCSA staff find that the proposed Meeting the Need, Academic, Organizational and Financial plans do not meet the standards as outlined in the charter application rubric. These ratings are a result of concerns and remaining questions in a number of areas, mainly in the academic and organizational areas. These are briefly outlined below and in subsequent pages.

The review committee and SPCSA staff find that the Las Vegas Montessori application meets the Geographic component of the of the Academic Needs within the SPCSA Academic and Demographic Needs Assessment. While some evidence of partnerships exists, the Committee to Form did not demonstrate significant evidence of solidified community partnerships, nor was it clear that the application reflects input of prospective parents and the local community. As such, the Meeting the Need section was rated as 'Approaches the Standard'.

Both the review committee and SPCSA staff find that the proposed academic plan, when considering the additional information provided during the capacity interview, does not meet the standard as outlined in the charter application rubric. While the Committee to Form was enthusiastic about the proposed model and spoke to the positive impact it has at the current private school, significant concerns remained after the capacity interview concluded. The application does not provide a clear explanation of the proposed curricula, nor is sufficient evidence presented in the application that confirms that the academic program is aligned to Nevada Academic Content Standards. Additionally, interventions

---

<sup>2</sup> The total enrollment presented in the Cover Sheet and in the Student and Recruitment section is 240 students, which differs from the submitted budget forms which total 250 students in Year 1.

for at-risk student populations are underdeveloped and specific supports for EL and special education students are vague. It is also not clear that the proposed assessments and performance goals will measure the success of the academic program.

The operations plan within the Las Vegas Montessori application included a few strengths that were determined to meet the standard within the rubric such as the qualifications and experience of the both the proposed governing body and the proposed Executive Director. However, concerns about the staffing plan, human resources, incubation year plan and the transition of the private school to a public charter school resulted in a rating for this section of 'Approaches the Standard'.

The review committee and SPCSA staff find that the financial plan also 'Approaches the Standard' as outlined in the charter application rubric. The submitted budget does not appear to account for all elements of the proposed academic plan.

For these major reasons, in addition to those outlined throughout this document, staff's recommendation is to deny the Las Vegas Montessori charter application.

***Proposed motion:*** Deny the Las Vegas Montessori charter application as submitted during the 2020 Summer Application Cycle based on a finding that the applicant has failed to satisfy the requirements contained in NRS 388A.249(3).

## Summary of Application Section Ratings

The State Public Charter School Authority is required to assemble a team of reviewers and conduct a thorough evaluation of the application, which includes an in-person interview with the applicant designed to elicit any necessary clarification or additional information about the proposed charter school. The SPCSA is required to adhere to its policies and practices, namely the application guidance, training and rubric, regarding evaluating charter applications. Ultimately, the SPCSA must base its determination on the documented evidence collected through the application process.

Rating options for each section are Meets the Standard; Approaches the Standard; Does not Meet the Standard. These are defined as follows:

- **Meets the Standard:** The response reflects a thorough understanding of key issues. It addresses the topic with specific and accurate information that shows thorough preparation; presents a clear, realistic picture of how the school expects to operate; and inspires confidence in the applicant's capacity to carry out the plan effectively in a way which will result in a 4- or 5-star school.
- **Approaches the Standard:** The response meets the criteria in many respects but lacks detail and/or requires additional information in one or more areas.
- **Does Not Meet the Standard:** The response is undeveloped or incomplete; demonstrates lack of preparation; or otherwise raises substantial concerns about the viability of the plan or the applicant's ability to carry it out.

The rubric is broken into four major sections, plus an addendum, as outlined below. Detailed descriptions of each rubric item can be found in the full rubric located on the SPCSA Application website:

[http://charterschools.nv.gov/OpenASchool/Application\\_Packet/](http://charterschools.nv.gov/OpenASchool/Application_Packet/)

## Summary of Application Section Ratings

Rating options for each section are Meets the Standard; Approaches the Standard; Does not Meet the Standard.

Application Section	Rating
<b>Meeting the Need</b>	<b>Approaches the Standard</b>
Mission and Vision	Meets the Standard
Targeted Plan	Approaches the Standard
Parent and Community Involvement	Approaches the Standard
<b>Academic Plan<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Does Not Meet the Standard</b>
Transformational Change	Approaches the Standard
Curriculum & Instructional Design	Does Not Meet the Standard
Promotion & High School Graduation Requirements	Does Not Meet the Standard
Driving for Results	Does Not Meet the Standard
At-Risk Students and Special Populations	Does Not Meet the Standard
School Structure: Culture	Approaches the Standard
School Structure: Student Discipline	Does Not Meet the Standard
School Structure: Calendar and Schedule	Approaches the Standard
<b>Operations Plan</b>	<b>Approaches the Standard</b>
Board Governance	Meets the Standard
Leadership Team	Meets the Standard
Staffing Plan	Approaches the Standard
Human Resources	Approaches the Standard
Student Recruitment and Enrollment	Approaches the Standard
Incubation Year Development	Approaches the Standard
Services	Approaches the Standard
Facilities	Approaches the Standard
Ongoing Operations	Meets the Standard
<b>Financial Plan</b>	<b>Approaches the Standard</b>

<sup>3</sup> The Las Vegas Montessori proposal did not contemplate Distance Education, Pre-Kindergarten, nor do they propose to contract with an EMO or CMO. Therefore, the corresponding sections of the rubric were not scored.

## Meeting the Need Section

The applicant has identified a target community that closely aligns to the Academic and Geographic Needs Assessment. Specifically, the applicant aims to serve a community with a high percentage of students in poverty and where there are a large number of existing 1- and 2-star schools. It is also clear that the proposed Board and school leader have experience within this community.

However, there is limited evidence of solidified community partnerships, or letters of support may not match the information presented in the narrative. During the capacity interview, it was reiterated that there is still work ahead of the Committee to Form in terms of finalizing partnerships, including those that were not mentioned in the application. This potential is encouraging as the proposed partners may be relevant to the target population, but falls short in terms of specificity and deliverables. There are also some questions about the involvement of prospective parents and community members in the development of the plan, specifically how the proposed plan has been iterated in response to community feedback. For these reasons, this section was rated as 'Approaches the Standard'.

### Areas of Strength

- The proposed mission of the school is clear and is reiterated throughout the application. The application outlines that the school intends to utilize the Montessori method to accomplish its goals and seeks to offer this type of education to many more students, particularly those that may be classified as at-risk. This commitment aligns to the priorities of the SPCSA.
- The application states that the school anticipates serving students living in the 89102, 89103, 89107, 89117, 89118, 89146 and 89147 zip codes. All of these zip codes are listed in the most recent SPCSA Needs Assessment. This appears to align with at least the Geographic section of the Academic Need.
- The Committee to Form demonstrates a high degree of knowledge about the proposed community to be served. Additionally, the proposed Executive Director has significant experience within the community as well.
- The application includes general letters of support from various organizations and individuals in the Las Vegas area.

### Areas of Concern

- While there is some evidence of relevant and solidified community partnerships, most appear to be in the initial stages with few concrete deliverables or accountability structures in place for both parties. This includes key partnerships with entities such as the Boys and Girls Club. During the capacity interview, it was stated that few new partnerships have been developed since the time the application was submitted. By way of example, the Committee to Form also indicated during the interview that the Urban League would continue to fund an aftercare program for select students (as they do in the private school setup) and that the Boys and Girls Club would be a key partner for the school, but limited information was included in the written application for

both prospective partners, and the specific role for both of these organizations is underdeveloped.

- Despite multiple opportunities provided during the capacity interview to share information or examples, it is not clear that the model has been adapted in response to the local community. Both the application and capacity interview raised questions about how the proposed school is tailored to the needs and desires of the community, and meaningful evidence of involvement by prospective parents and the target population in the development of the plan was not presented. While the proposal has been informed by current private school parents, it is expected that the target population of the charter school would look a bit different given that the school would no longer require tuition, and that the school plans to grow.
- The Committee to Form expresses a commitment to serve a representative population, in particular underserved students, the application does not present capacity or credible plans to serve these students. More specifically, there does not appear to be sufficient staff and resources to meet the needs for Special Education and EL students, nor is there a clear plan to acclimate students to the Montessori model who may enter in the upper grade levels.



## Academic Section

The Committee to Form demonstrated a passion for the Montessori method, and the applicant team including the proposed Principal have first-hand experience implementing the model or supporting their children within the model. The application also notes a number of successful Montessori schools throughout the country as evidence that this can be a strong educational option for prospective students.

Significant concerns and questions were identified by the review committee and SPCSA staff that led to this section being rated as 'Does Not Meet the Standard'. It remains unclear that a proposed curriculum has been finalized, and that the instructional design resources that are included are aligned to the Nevada Academic Content Standards (NVACS). The proposed assessments for tracking student progress appear to be only partially developed and may not lead to a 4- or 5-star school under the Nevada School Performance Framework (NSPF). Additionally, it is not clear how the school plans to use the assessments and available indicators to make critical promotion and retention decisions. Lastly, throughout both the application and during the capacity interview, the Committee to Form was unable to articulate a robust plan for how at-risk students will be assisted within the proposal, and few specific strategies or details about these specific student supports were provided.

### Areas of Strength

- The Committee to Form, including the Executive Director, understand that public charter schools must be open and accessible to all students, and emphasized that this is how the current private school operates. The applicant is committed to ensuring this is communicated to all families, and is passionate about the prospect of serving any student that might enroll.
- The Montessori model has been proven and tested over the last century, and the proposed governing board is dedicated to the model, the team, and – in many cases – the results that they have seen borne out personally. The proposed Executive Director has been identified, and has significant experience with the Montessori method.
- Spring Valley Montessori School currently implements the Terra Nova 2 exam. No evidence was provided to indicate that this exam aligns to state standards and the review team was unable to determine as much. Nevertheless, the results presented in the application show promise for the proposed model.

### Areas of Concern

- The applicant was unable to provide clarity or evidence that a final curriculum was included in the application that was aligned to the NVACS. During the capacity interview, the Committee to Form did speak to the resources included in the application, and how they were critical to the delivery of the Montessori model, but resources are not the same as curricula. Moreover, the appendix shows a third-party crosswalk of Montessori activities with the common core, but specific information about how the academic program at the proposed school would align to the Nevada Academic Content Standards was not included. During the interview, the Committee to Form intimated that there is more work to do in this area, and that the curricula could be evolving.

- Promotion and retention requirements for the proposed school lacked specificity. More detail is necessary as some conflicting information was presented in the application.
- Limited evidence was provided within the application and during the capacity interview that the proposed school has a robust and aligned assessment plan that can ensure student progress is tracked throughout the year, culminating in the required state assessments. An application for tracking data is helpful for data-driven instruction and monitoring but is not the equivalent of a formal student assessment. Additionally, it is unclear if the Committee to Form has a firm grasp of the performance goals included in the application, both in terms of how they were established and what they measure. The Committee to Form, Board and Principal did not demonstrate a strong understanding of what the NWEA-MAP measures, and this is the only normed interim assessment listed in the application.
- The Committee to Form was unable to clearly articulate details about programs, strategies and supports for at-risk student populations (IEP and EL) to be served under the model, and few specifics were provided in the application. There is no doubt that these students can be served within a Montessori model, but more information is needed to understand how they will be identified and how the model works for these students in a public setting with specific state the federal requirements as compared to the private setting.
- The proposed Executive Director stated that they will ensure that NVACS is aligned to their proposed program by hiring certified teachers and those with a Montessori certificate. This is highly concerning as certification and teacher preparation do not inherently result in standards-based instruction.
- Little information is provided within the application regarding professional development and specifics about how it will be implemented in coordination with the instructional design of the school, a critical detail for a school that is proposing to implement a unique educational model and philosophy. A clear, robust process for developing and retaining Montessori teachers is absent.
- The description of the RTI process and remediation for students is underdeveloped as presented within the application. Monitoring systems and student evaluation processes are vague, and it is not clear what is meant by systemic, non-systemic and standard observations. More specifics are needed to better understand the proposed strategies and continuum of services for students, especially given the target community that the school plans to educate.
- Little information is included in the regarding vulnerable student populations and how they will not be disproportionately impacted by the proposed discipline policies. Additionally, discipline goals do not appear to be included in the proposal and it is not clear that school has a Restorative Justice plan. This is particularly concerning given the projected student demographic that the school anticipates serving.

## Operations Section

Both in the written application and during the capacity interview, the Committee to Form and proposed Executive Director demonstrated that they are passionate about the school proposal, and are dedicated to opening a school that can serve all students. The proposed Board is well-qualified, demonstrated the ability to work well as a team when presented with a real-life scenario, and has already recognized that they may be asked to make difficult decisions in spite of the fact that many proposed members have previous connections with the proposed Executive Director.

Despite these strengths, there were a number of areas identified in the proposal that solidified an 'Approaches the Standard' rating. With regard to the staffing plan, there are a few major concerns of the review committee, including the lack of adequate support for students identified as special education and English Learners. The application and governing board also make a number of assumptions that do not appear to be realistic, specifically around the readiness of teachers who may not be well-versed in the Montessori model. The review team also identified concerns related to the transition of the currently operating private school to a public charter school during an eight-month timeframe with limited staff. Finally, questions remain about the current demand for the school, and if current plans will allow the school to successfully recruit students from the targeted community in order to be fully enrolled prior to opening.

### Areas of Strength

- The written application and capacity interview reiterated a commitment to governance, oversight and accountability by the proposed governing board. Additionally, the Committee to Form provided adequate responses regarding questions about possible parental bias or previous connection with the private school, indicating that they would be prepared for the potential difficult decisions that a board might need to address.
- The proposed governing board possesses tremendous knowledge about the proposed community, and had started door-to-door recruitment prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. Additionally, the proposed Executive Director has worked in the community as a Principal for a number of years, demonstrating that she possesses many of the skills necessary for a prospective school leader.
- Through the scenario-based question, it was clear that the Committee to Form has the capacity to develop an elevator speech and is ready and willing to recruit students and families to the school. The Committee to Form appears knowledgeable about the Montessori method of instruction despite some gaps in specificity (see academic section) and prepared to work as a team.

### Areas of Concern

- The staffing model as presented within the application does not appear to be adequate in a number of areas, including the proposed staffing levels to support students with special needs and EL services. The school proposes to staff one special education-certified teacher in the upper elementary grades as a homeroom teacher. This approach has substantial challenges, most

notably that the homeroom teacher would be tasked with managing and monitoring IEPs along with all typical responsibilities of a homeroom teacher. Additionally, it is not clear who would provide special education services throughout the school day. Additionally, the staffing plan includes zero EL specialists that could support EL instruction school-wide on a daily basis. The school plans for all homeroom teachers to be TESOL certified (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages), but this raises significant capacity concerns about the plan being able to meet the needs of the projected student population and the targeted community.

- During the capacity interview, the proposed principal clarified that the Montessori certificate that is being required of all teaching staff would be completed online, with herself acting as the mentor as part of the certification process. There was a verbal commitment to have these certificates completed prior to the start of opening, but this isn't captured in the incubation year plan, the cost does not appear to be included in the budget, and it is not clear that this can be done prior to the start of school. The proposed Board went on to share that it may be possible for Teach For America teachers to get these certificates as well, but this does not seem feasible in a short timeframe prior to the start of the school year.
- The model requires teachers to provide instruction in all content areas, including specials, which requires a particular set of skills, raising questions about teacher recruitment and the ability of the school to provide high-quality teachers support and development. Additionally, with teachers responsible for specials, it is not clear when teachers would have time for prep or meetings during the school day. More clarity is needed to more fully understand the roles of the leadership team on a day-to-day basis, and how staff training and development will occur.
- The application includes a number of interest forms, but only a subset of those provided appear to be from the targeted zip codes, and some are from 2019. Additionally, it was confirmed during the interview that about 25% of those forms come from current private school parents, raising some questions about the demand for the school and its ability to reach the targeted enrollment figures provided in the application.
- The Committee to Form did not present a strong, coherent plan for how the transition of the current private school will occur simultaneously with the opening of the proposed school. This work requires significant responsibilities, and it is not clear that the staffing and resources allocated to the incubation year will enable the school to reach the necessary milestones to make this transition. The plan does not demonstrate a sound understanding of the staffing needs that may be required to open successfully.

## Financial Section

The financial plan presented shows a surplus in each year of the proposed charter, and proposed salaries seem reasonable for teachers and administrative staff as compared to those of the local district. Additionally, the application includes plans to contract with a back-office provider to oversee payroll and benefits management.

The review committee did identify a few noteworthy gaps within the financial plan that ultimately resulted in this section being rated as 'Approaches the Standard'. First, after-care appears to be a key service that the school anticipates providing, with or without a community partner. It is not clear that this potential cost is included in the budget. Additionally, a few tools or resources that were mentioned in the narrative may not be accounted for in the budget. Lastly, there appears to be misalignment between the staffing plan and the budget in terms of positions described in the narrative, and it is not clear that the Montessori certificate program or costs associated with Teach For America are included as a potential cost to the school as described during the capacity interview.

### Areas of Strength

- The proposal includes plans to contract with Automatic Data Processing (ADP) to provide payroll and benefits management. These costs appear reasonable as presented within the budget.
- Teacher compensation packages appear within a reasonable range as compared to salaries within the Clark County School District.

### Areas of Concern

- The staffing model and line items allocated for Special Education and EL student supports appear to be underdeveloped. It is likely that more resources will be needed to adequately support these student populations within the proposed educational program.
- It is not clear that a few tools or resources included in the narrative are also accounted for in the budget. These include: Montessori Management software, Student Tag, Real Time Student Metrics, and Cougar Denali Accounting Software.
- The presented budget does not appear to include the Montessori certificate program, which is required of all teachers as described in the narrative, and a potential partnership with Teach For America for staffing purposes. These were mentioned at-length during the capacity interview, thus raising questions about where they are allocated for in the budget.
- After-care is mentioned as a potential service to be provided to students, and the narrative indicates that the school is prepared to offer this service without a community partner. However, there does not appear to be a corresponding line item in the budget. This raises concerns about the viability of this program.

# Capacity Interview Summary

Based on the independent and collective review of the application, the review committee conducted a virtual capacity interview of the applicant to assess the capacity to execute the application’s overall plan. The capacity interview for Las Vegas Montessori was conducted on Wednesday, September 23, and lasted approximately 120-minutes. All members of the Committee to Form attended the interview. Additionally, Board counsel for Las Vegas Montessori also attended. Questions during the capacity interview focused primarily on these areas:

Community Partnerships	Student Recruitment and Enrollment
Curriculum & Instructional Design	Staffing
Driving for Results	Incubation Year Development
At-Risk Students & Special Populations	Financial Plan
Board Governance	

Lastly, the capacity interview included a scenario-based question that probed the Committee to Form’s capacity to develop a plan to market to families and recruit potential students.

# District Input

Per Assembly Bill 462 (2019), the SPCSA solicited input from the Clark County School District regarding this application.<sup>4</sup> The timeline regarding this request for input is below and the response provided by the Clark County School district is attached.

- August 26, 2020 – Memo sent to CCSD soliciting input.
- September 28, 2020 – Written input provided from CCSD to SPCSA.

---

<sup>4</sup> Assembly Bill 462 (2019) section 6.3, subsection 1, paragraph (d): “The proposed sponsor of a charter school shall, in reviewing an application to form a charter school...If the proposed sponsor is not the board of trustees of a school district, solicit input from the board of trustees of the school district in which the proposed charter school will be located.”

## Appendix (Rubric Detail)

The information below indicates *rubric criteria that the applicant did not substantially meet*.

### Meeting the Need

- **Targeted Plan**
  - *Clear and comprehensive explanation of how the proposed model meets identified community needs.*
- **Parent and Community Involvement**
  - *Demonstrates clear evidence of the involvement of parents, neighborhood, and/or community members representative of target population in the development of the plan.*
  - *Identifies specific partnerships which are shown to be relevant to the needs of the target population, including partners located in the community that the applicant intends to serve. Partnerships are evidenced by specific letters of commitment outlining the accountabilities of both parties and clear, measurable, time-specific deliverables from the partner which are clearly relevant to the needs of the target population.*

### Academic Plan

- **Transformational Change**
  - *The Committee to Form demonstrates an ambitious, yet achievable plan that will be able to:*
    - *Provide families with high quality schools: the SPCSA aims for a majority of schools to be rated as 4- or 5-stars.*
    - *Ensure that every SPCSA student succeeds—including those from historically underserved student groups: the SPCSA aims for all sponsored schools to demonstrate strong academic growth, high levels of proficiency, and on-time graduation across all student groups, including historically underserved student groups.*
  - *The Committee to Form demonstrates that the key features of the proposed school can be implemented together in a coherent and cohesive manner that will drive towards meeting the proposed mission and vision.*
- **Curriculum and Instructional Design**
  - *A clear explanation, supported by evidence, demonstrating how the school's academic program aligns to the Nevada Academic Content Standards, including both the Common Core Academic Standards and the Next Generation Science Standards, and that the school teachers all required subjects at each grade level.*
  - *Instructional programs offer a continuum of services to students through a tiered system of interventions, ensuring that all students, including those who are in need of remediation, English Learners, and those who are intellectually gifted, are able to build the knowledge base necessary to access rigorous instruction.*
  - *Plans for professional development show a direct connection to the instructional methods and curricula that teachers will be required to use.*
- **Promotion & High School Graduation Requirements**
  - *Structures are in place to support students at risk of dropping out, including those who are overage for grade, those needing access to credit-recovery options, and those performing significantly below grade level.*
  - *Promotion standards for students are clearly defined and measurable, demonstrating high expectations for all students.*
- **Driving for Results**

- *The school's internal, leading indicator goals clearly align to Nevada School Performance Framework and the Authority Performance Framework.*
- *There is a clear process for setting, monitoring and/or revising internal leading indicator academic goals.*
- *Internal assessments selections will provide sufficiently rich data for evaluation of the education program and fully align with State assessments, State standards and the curriculum presented.*
- *The assessment plan is sufficiently detailed to demonstrate collection and analysis of individual student, student cohorts and school-level performance over time (interim, annual, year over year), including a clear process for setting and monitoring ambitious academic goals.*
- *Demonstrates the validity and reliability of any internal non-standardized assessments, as well as how these assessments are aligned with the school design and high expectations.*
- *Articulates process for utilizing data to support instruction and providing adequate training to teachers and school leaders.*
- *Sound plan for measuring and reporting academic performance and progress of students.*
- **At-Risk Students and Special Populations**
  - *The Committee to Form outlines the methods according to which the school will remediate academically underperforming students, including the system according to which the school will track progress, facilitate teacher collaboration, and the research supporting the school's remediation strategy.*
  - *Provides clear and appropriate delineation within the state-mandated Response to Intervention model.*
  - *The Committee to Form demonstrates that they will be able to provide all special education and related services needed either by the staff listed on their organization chart or identified external groups with whom they can contract to provide needed services.*
  - *The Committee to Form outlines comprehensive and logical plans to train staff in modifying the curriculum and instruction to address the unique needs of students with disabilities.*
  - *Devotes adequate resources and staff to meeting the needs of all students.*
- **School Structure: Culture**
  - *Describes a concrete plan for norming social/cultural expectations at the start of each semester as well as for students who enter mid-year.*
  - *Well-defined goals around school culture and plans to monitor progress.*
- **School Structure: Student Discipline**
  - *A plan to ensure vulnerable student populations are not disproportionately impacted by discipline policies.*
  - *Goals for student behavior are clear and measurable; there is a plan, and designated personnel, for monitoring and reporting related to behavior goals as well as ongoing maintenance of discipline records.*
  - *Student behavior plan integrates clear, logical use of methods of restorative justice per Assembly Bill 168 (2019).*
- **School Structure: Calendar and Schedule**
  - *Outlines meaningful goals for student attendance and plans to monitor and adjust as needed.*

## Operations Plan

- **Staffing Plan**
  - *Appropriately staffed to meet the needs of the expected student population, including special student populations.*



- *Staffing plan aligns to the applicant's commitment to meet the needs identified in the Academic and Demographic Needs Assessment.*
- *Sound understanding of staffing needs necessary for the new school proposed.*
- **Human Resources**
  - *School staffing structure that ensure high-quality teacher support/development, student/family support, effective school operations, and compliance with all applicable policies and procedures.*
- **Student Recruitment and Enrollment**
  - *Includes outreach and recruitment strategies that demonstrates an understanding of the community likely to be served and is likely to allow the school to enroll sufficient numbers of students who are representative of either the surrounding zoned schools or a mission-specific educationally disadvantaged population.*
  - *Demonstrated interest and intent to enroll commitments by a significant number of parents for Year 1.*
- **Incubation Year Development**
  - *The staffing outlined for Year 0 will enable the school to reach its Year 0 milestones and goals.*
- **Services**
  - *Operations plan includes logical plans for all essential and program-specific, non-academic services, including but not limited to: staff structure/plan is adequate for the proposed school and aligns with the educational program; lines of authority are clear.*

#### **Financial Plan**

- *School level budget priorities are consistent with the operator's model, including but not limited to: educational program, staffing, and facility.*
- *No essential services are funded at amounts that would preclude the Committee to Form from implementing their plan.*